

## ЯЗЫКОЗНАНИЕ

UDC 811.512.1

## Apprehensive in Cypriot Turkish

G. S. Sakhatova

Georg-August-Universität Göttingen  
14, Heinrich-Düker-Weg, Göttingen, 37073, Germany

**For citation:** Sakhatova G. S. Apprehensive in Cypriot Turkish. *Vestnik of Saint Petersburg University. Asian and African Studies*, 2018, vol. 10, issue 3, pp. 315–329. <https://doi.org/10.21638/spbu13.2018.303>

The paper deals with the means of expressing the apprehensive in languages of the Oghuz branch of Turkic languages using Cypriot Turkish (CT) as an example. The treatment is based on language materials which were collected by the author during field studies in Cyprus. Grammatical and lexical markers which are used by the speaker of CT to express the apprehensive are not similar to those used in Standard Turkish. The *different* lexical and grammatical model for expressing the apprehensive in CT is considered in previous studies as *non-Turkic* and contact-induced under the influence of Cypriot-Greek language. For the purpose of comparative description apprehensive creation formulas in the related Oghuz languages such as Turkmen, Azerbaijanian and Turkish will be given. Based on these morphologic-semantic analogies found it is argued that the CT apprehensive model is not necessarily a result of Turkish-Greek language contacts. Moreover, it seems that it probably existed already in the Turkic inventory of native speakers before their migration to the island after its conquest by the Ottoman Empire in 1570/1571.

**Keywords:** apprehensive, Oghuz languages, Cypriot-Turkish, Turkish, Turkmen, Azerbaijanian, apprehensive markers, expressing apprehensive in Turkic languages.

## 1. Introduction

Identification and description of linguistic instruments for expressing apprehension in Turkic languages has not been investigated until the present, neither in Turkish studies, nor in typological research of world languages<sup>1</sup>.

Semantics of fear is known in linguistics as the **apprehensive**. In a broad sense it is an expression of apprehension and warning and has a distinct unreal semantics when

<sup>1</sup> Within the scope of this article, the terms ‘apprehension’ and ‘apprehensive’ will be used as synonyms.

the speaker expresses fear about the possibility of an undesirable, from his point of view, situation. The irreality, or counterfactual, nature of the apprehensive is determined by the fact that an undesirable situation could have occurred, or is referred to the foreseeable, immediate future; i.e., it is hypothetical [1, p. 441–449; 2; 3]<sup>2</sup>. Further, N. Dobrushina [7, p. 28–30] notes that the apprehensive is a verbal form that denotes fear and serves as a message that an undesirable situation can happen and the speaker communicates it with fear, i.e. ‘an undesirable, from the speaker’s point of view, situation that was about to happen’. Plungian [1, p. 448] notes that the meaning of the apprehensive involves two semantic focuses: 1) modal-appraisal, a message about a hypothetical situation and its negative ethical evaluation; 2) emotional-fear about the onset of an undesirable situation. V. Guzev’s grammar [8, p. 178–180] provides a general definition of modality, its content and varieties, such as the *assumption of the probability of some action, confidence or doubt in the reality of the communicated event, awareness of uncertainty of something, etc.; the subjective emotional state of an individual as a source of modality*.

The author of this article pursues two goals:

1. To describe the type of the apprehensive identified in Cypriot Turkish<sup>3</sup>, which enables a speaker to convey the meaning<sup>4</sup> that *an undesirable event would/could have happened in a moment*,
2. To compare the modes of shaping the apprehensive in related languages within the Oghuz subgroup.

The semantics of the apprehensive is conveyed in Cypriot Turkish in an integrated way. This includes, primarily, lexical tools, such as circumstantial adverbs: *hazır* meaning ‘ready, prepared / just about’ and *az kala* ‘almost / a bit more (and) / nearly / little was left to...’, which, in combination with morphological markers, such as hortative affixes -AyIm (Voluntative, first person singular) and -sIn (Voluntative, third person singular) formulate the meaning of ‘an unpleasant or undesirable, from the point of view of a speaker, event that could have happened in a moment’. Some researchers consider this pattern of expressing apprehension, i.e., the usage of the adverb *hazır* and verbal markers of mood, as *non-Turkic*, established through insular language contacts, primarily between Cypriot Turkish and Cypriot Greek (CG). Various meanings of *hazır* will be discussed in Section 5.

In this article, the author does not discriminate between the terms ‘language’, ‘dialect’, and ‘sub-dialect’, and refers Cypriot Turkish as a ‘language’. Further, motivation of the selected term Voluntative applied for the apprehensive markers in CT will be described.

The article will briefly present the current linguistic situation with CT in Cyprus. This will be followed by a review of the available studies, which generally mention the presence of unreal modal verbal constructions in CT, differing by their modes of implementation from those in Standard Turkish. Notably, researchers compare them only with the equivalents existing in contemporary literary Turkish and are unanimous that these modes result from the influence of Cypriot Greek on Cypriot Turkish.

The last section of this article will present formulas to express the apprehensive in Cypriot Turkish, Turkmen, Turkish and Azerbaijani. These tabular data are based on the

<sup>2</sup> On the problematics of grammatical categories, such as *irrealis*, *irreality*, see also J. R. Elliot [4]; F. Lichtenberk [5]; A. Urmanchieva [6].

<sup>3</sup> Cypriot Turkish will henceforth be referred to as CT in the text.

<sup>4</sup> The problems of meaning and sense are detailed in the studies of Bondarko 2002: 112–114, 138–139; Guzev 2015: 15–19.

findings of our studies on identifying the meanings of this type of the apprehensive in Oghuz languages<sup>5</sup>. Phonetic symbols adopted in Turkology practice are used in the article, for example, symbol < i > denoting the sound < ı > in CT.

Finally, the findings will be summarized and the respective conclusions will be drawn, with view of the fact that the grammar semantics of the *irrealis* in general, and the apprehensive in particular, have not yet been studied systematically in Turkic languages.

## 2. Notes on the terminology of the Voluntative

Within the scope of this article, the chosen term Voluntative is deemed the most appropriate in terms of expression and semantics of the apprehensive, as determined by the following factors. In Turkic studies published nationally and abroad, as well as grammar handbooks and scientific literature on Turkish and Turkic languages, the affixes -(y)AyIm 1<sup>st</sup> person singular and -sIn 3<sup>rd</sup> person singular are traditionally referred to as the Optative 1<sup>st</sup> person singular, and Imperative 3<sup>rd</sup> person singular, respectively<sup>6</sup>; further, in Kononov's grammar [10, p. 246] -(y)AyIm 1<sup>st</sup> person singular is a form of imperfect (present-future tense) optative mood consisting of the optative affix -(y)A and personal affixes -(y)Im of the present tense.

Adamović [11, p. 242–248] amends the grammatical category of 'volitional modality' in modern Turkish with another paradigm, the hortative affix -(y)AyIm 1<sup>st</sup> person singular (Voluntative).

According to Adamović, the voluntative is one of the oldest paradigms and is close to the optative by its semantics (expression of desire). On the other hand, it has points of intersection with the Aorist, since the latter can also express readiness to perform an action.

The morpheme -sIn is traditionally attributed to the imperative paradigm (Imperative 3<sup>rd</sup> person singular). As mentioned in Kononov's grammar [10, p. 219, 221], its meaning in modern Turkish is used to express sudden, unexpected actions and the associated surprise or amazement. In this regard, it should be added that -sIn, as will be seen from the CT examples below, also serves as a morphological marker to express semantics of the apprehensive.

At the same time, it is well known that finite forms shaped via -sIn can bear optative meanings, as well [11, p. 239]; according to Guzev [8, p. 215], the imperative form for the 3<sup>rd</sup> person mainly functions in interaction with the optative mood forms. Ersen-Rasch [12, p. 189] calls the Turkish affixes -(y)AyIm for 1<sup>st</sup> person singular and -sIn 3<sup>rd</sup> person singular, a paradigm of the Voluntative, where -(y)AyIm is a marker to express *spontaneous* desires of a speaker<sup>7</sup>.

Proceeding from the above considerations, morphological markers -(y)AyIm 1<sup>st</sup> person singular and -sIn 3<sup>rd</sup> person singular used to express the apprehensive semantics in Cypriot Turkish are united under the term Voluntative, which makes possible to organize a complex diversity of their modal, i.e., semantic, meanings in conditions of intersection

<sup>5</sup> On the apprehensive in Oghuz group of Turkic languages, see Sakhatova (in press).

<sup>6</sup> Göksel and Kerslike explained this as the case of volitional modality, i.e., voluntative, optative modality [9, p. 361, 545]

<sup>7</sup> Aslan-Demir explores in detail the 'optative mood' category in Turkish, from a semantic-pragmatic standpoint [13].

and juxtaposition of modal systems. The Voluntative is present in many Turkish dialects, as well as in Turkmen, Altai, Tuva, Kyrgyz, Uzbek, and other Turkic languages.

### 3. A brief overview of the current situation in Cypriot Turkish

The modern Turkish stands for a state language across the Northern part of the island of Cyprus (Turkish name KKTC > Kuzey Kıbrıs Türk Cumhuriyeti > the **Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus**, unrecognized by the global community). It also acts as a language of education, writing and mass media, while in colloquial speech, both informal and formal (except for official documentation), the Cypriots use actively Cypriot Turkish. This so-called Turkish part of the island is inhabited by over 300,000 people. Despite the lack of specific statistics on local CT-speaking Cypriots, Cypriot Turkish has the status of a reputable spoken standard language, *koiné*. It was shaped from Turkic dialects, whose native speakers were moved to Cyprus starting from 1570/1571, i.e., after the Ottoman conquest [see 14–19].

It is also noteworthy that expatriates and their descendants that moved to the island from various areas of the modern Turkey after an armed conflict and partitioning of the island into the Southern and Northern parts in 1974, do not only speak Cypriot Turkish, but consider themselves Cypriots, as well. However, from the standpoint of local population, both Turkic- and Greek-speaking, they are immigrants from Turkey that speak various Anatolian dialects of Turkish.

Overall, the reputable status of CT as a spoken language is not quite a common phenomenon, since the dialects in Turkey are not attributed such status [20; 21, p. 36; 22].

Thus, CT of today is a live oral language spoken by local Cypriots in almost all spheres of everyday and official life.

Kappler explains this linguistic situation from a socio-linguistic point of view, i.e. primarily by the desire of local Cypriots to preserve their Turkish Cypriot identity in conditions, where their language coexists with the modern Turkish and its dialects [21, p. 36]<sup>8</sup>.

The island is also inhabited by other Turkic speakers, e.g., the Turks from Bulgaria, who moved there from the late 1980s [14].

### 4. A review of studies on constructions with irreal meaning

As noted above, the CT studies refer to it as the Cypriot dialect of Turkish, or the Turkish dialect of Cyprus. Under these studies, CT is generally described in comparison with the modern standard Turkish [24; 25]. Along with that, researchers traditionally register the presence or absence of certain linguistic phenomena between these languages. Certain properties in CT, as compared with the modern Turkish, has already led to the conclusion that these properties are either archaic, i.e., are present in CT only [14, p. 223–225; 26]<sup>9</sup>, or result from Turkish-Greek language contacts.

<sup>8</sup> See also [18; 23].

<sup>9</sup> See Vancō-Osam [26], with numerous examples of the archaic word stocks of CT, as compared with modern Turkish; for illustrative purpose, we will focus on two entries only, namely the verb 'işlemek' 'work' and the interrogative word *haçan(a)* 'when', which, according to the author, are found in CT exclusively. Actually, the word stocks of both related languages, Turkmen and Azerbaijani, contain both lexemes like *işlemek / işləmək* or *haçan /*.

However, even a cursory look at the phonological and morphological inventory of CT reveal numerous similarities in comparison with the inventory of the Oghuz language subgroup. To mention just a few: the presence of affix *-lk* for 1st person plural, for example, in *gelerik* ‘we will come/we come’, or the nasal <η>, for example in *nāpaη*, ‘what are you doing’ / how are things’, etc. Further, such phenomena as the assimilation of sounds in CT, is also observed, for example, in Turkmen.

As noted above, there is a total lack of studies on the modes of expressing apprehensive-fear in Cypriot Turkish and other Turkic languages.

A number of publications [14; 20; 27–30], dedicated to the specific features of syntax, tense and modal constructions, provide general observations about the categories conveying the unreal action in CT and are marked as *subjunctive* or *possibility modal constructions*. Notably, that these categories are generally considered by researchers in comparison with their equivalents in modern Turkish, and partly in Greek-Cypriot languages. The work of Abdurrazak [14] is the only one to mention (but not viewed in detail) similarities in the implementation of unreal meaning in CT, as well as in modern and old Azerbaijani languages.

Let us take a closer look at these works.

Demir [27, p.106], when describing the semantics of expression of an undesirable action, calls it by the term *form of approximation*, < turk. *yaklaşma* > *proximity* / *approximation*, exemplified by the following statement: *hazır düşeyim*, ‘I could (almost / would) fall / a little bit more and I would have fallen.’ The author points out to the fact that such morpho-lexical mode of expressing the *approximation* of a possible action or event is absent in Turkish and its dialects.

Kappler [28, p.215–216] examines the unreal constructions in CT with the meaning of apprehensive as ‘subjunctive’. The word *hazır* is denoted as a *modal marker* and he defines its role as a parenthetical word to the verb in the subjunctive mood. According to Kappler, the CT word *hazır* is a possible result of *selective copying* of the Greek word *etimos*, ‘ready’. Moreover, the author indicates the presence of the word *xaziri* in Cypriot Greek as a phenomenon of *reverse copying* from Cypriot Turkish. Relying on these observations and comparisons with modern Turkish, Kappler concludes that the modes of expressing subjunctive constructions in CT are different from those in modern Turkish and here, in his opinion, we observe not only the Greek influence, but also the grammaticalization of the lexeme *hazır* into a modality marker, caused primarily by the Greek-Turkish language contacts.

Further, in Gulle’s study [30, p. 103–104], constructions with the word *hazır* are denoted as *possibility modal constructions* and the way of their formation is also viewed as borrowed from Greek.

Obviously, the authors of these studies do not distinguish the category of the apprehensive as an expressed semantics of undesirable actions, not to mention that apprehensive constructions are termed differently. However, as noted above, the major problem lies in the scarcity of related languages compared under these works, rather than diversity of terms and names. With no direct analogues in Turkish to be compared with Cypriot Turkish, the researchers are unanimous in their assumption of the Cypriot Greek influence on the mode to express irreal meanings in Cypriot Turkish.

Abdurrazak [14, p.200–226] examines the ways of expressing modal (unreal) meanings in CT in general, in the same manner as previous researchers, and notes their similarities with modern and old Azerbaijani. Though unsupported by an ample amount of

examples, the author calls to account for these facts when studying the features of modality expression in 'subjunctive mood' constructions. Along with that, the author also puts forward a hypothesis about the Arabic influence on the modes of expressing the semantics of desire. Further, noting the close relationship between the languages of Cyprus, he concludes that given the presence of live Turkish-Greek bilingualism prior to 1974, the expression of modality in CT was mostly influenced by Cypriot Greek<sup>10</sup>.

It is worth mentioning here that Cypriot Greek-Turkish bilingualism/multilingualism, both written and oral, still remains understudied. Historical data on Cypriot written bilingualism (with Ottoman and Greek) are not studied systematically. Therefore, statements that some linguistic phenomenon of the spoken language (Cypriot Turkish, in this case) shows no similarity with the written Turkish, lacking sound documentation, evidence and references, present great difficulties [31]. The above mentioned interconnection of the island's languages actually exists, first and foremost in the word stocks of Cypriot Greek, Cypriot Turkish and other languages.

Summarizing this review of the literature, it should be noted that the common feature of all these studies is that their conclusions are derived from a comparative analysis of two languages only, where the lack of, or rather non-conformity of CT data with the standards of the Turkish literary language formed the basis for conclusions about their *non-Turkic* origin in CT through borrowing from Cypriot Greek. The mixed terminology used in these studies betrays how poor knowledge has accumulated in the subject area.

## 5. Expressing the apprehensive in Cypriot Turkish

Data collected by the author demonstrate that the CT-speakers conveyed the semantics of the apprehension with a meaning 'an undesired event could happen in a moment' for 1<sup>st</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> persons singular and 1st person plural in an integrated way, i.e. with the aid of the following grammatical and lexical markers:

(a) morphological markers:

hortative affixes -(y)AyIm (Voluntative 1<sup>st</sup> person singular) and -sIn (Voluntative 3<sup>rd</sup> person singular)<sup>11</sup>;

(b) lexical markers:

the word *hazır* in the meaning 'ready / prepared / just about' and the word *az gala* 'almost / a bit more (and) / nearly / little was left to...'

Thus, the following formula shows up:

*hazır* / *az gala* + verb stem + -(y)AyIm / -sIn

Let us consider the following examples.

(1) *hazır gül-eyim, zor dut-dum gendimi*

<sup>10</sup> The remark made by Abdurrazak [14, p.221] '...the presence of Crypto-Christians on the island, who had a very mixed ethical and linguistic background (Greek, Italian, French, Syriac, Arabic, maybe Armenian), had contributed to the development of TDC (=Turkish dialects of Cyprus) as well' needs more in-depth and detailed study, which has yet to be done up to the present day.

<sup>11</sup> A. Shcherbak notes that in many Turkic languages, the suffix -Ay for expressing desire has a very diverse semantic connotation, up to the semantics of the indicativum (futurum) in some Turkic languages, and gives the following examples: *alôm* 'I would take / I've a good mind to take' in Azerbaijani; *yaşurayın* 'I've a good mind to hide' in old-Uzbek, etc. [32, p. 52–57].



**ready to laugh-VOL-1.Sg** barely restrained-I-myself

**APPR**

‘A bit more and I would have laughed, I hardly restrained myself’

(2) *az gala evet de-sin*

**little left yes to say -VOL-3.Sg**

**APPR**

‘A bit more and she would have said yes’

(3) *hazir yaka-sin-a*

*yapiş-ayim*

*o da*

*gavga ed-sin*

**ready collar-Poss3.Sg-Dat grab- VOL-1.Sg s(he) quarrel -VOL-3.Sg**

**APPR**

**APPR**

‘A bit more and I would have grabbed him by the collar and he would have started a quarrel / fight’

(4) *hazir bir kaza ol-sun*

**ready one accident be-VOL-3.Sg**

**APPR**

‘An accident nearly happened / a bit more and an accident would have happened’

(5) *hazir brag-ayim*

*gennim-i*

*yatağ-ında*

**ready to throw -VOL- 1.Sg myself-Acc bed-Poss3Sg-Loc**

**APPR**

‘A bit more and I would have thrown myself in his bed’

(6) *neyisa, bre herif de-di-m*

*gal-asin buraşda ve*

**anyway, my friend said-Perf-1.Sg**

**will stay-you here and**

*hazir gir-ayim onu*

**ready to break-VOL-1Sg him**

**APPR**

‘Anyway, my friend, I said, you will stay here; a bit more and I would have *broken* him into pieces / and I nearly beat him up’

(7) *hazir gak-ayim,*

*anihdaları*

*al-i-yim,*

**ready to get up-VOL-1Sg keys**

**to take-VOL-1.Sg**

**APPR**

**APPR**

*gizi gurdar-ayim*

**girl to rescue-VOL-1Sg**

**APPR**

‘A bit more/ in a moment I would have got up, taken the keys and saved the girl’

(8) *hazir bar bar bağir-sin,*

*çığır-sin*

**ready mightily mightily to scream-VOL-3.Sg yell-VOL-3.Sg**

**APPR**

**APPR**

‘She has nearly screamed in full force / in a moment she would have screamed at full throat’

(9) *hazir sarmaş dolaş ol-alım, yat-alım,*

*öb-eyim gendini*

**ready to hug -VOL-1.Pl**

**APPR**

**to sleep-VOL-1.Pl**

**APPR**

**to kiss VOL-1Sg her**

**APPR**

‘A bit more and we would have hugged one another (very tightly), slept together and I would have kissed her’

As can be seen from these examples, a CT-speaker makes no semantic differences between the circumstantial adverbs *hazır* and *az gala*. The word *hazır* is of Persian origin and has various meanings, such as ‘now’, ‘in a moment’, ‘right now’, ‘immediately’, ‘at the same moment’, ‘right away’, ‘promptly’, ‘at once’, ‘instantly’, ‘in the nearest/ foreseeable future’, as well as ‘to be present/to be here’. It also exists in Azerbaijani and Turkish in the meaning ‘ready/ prepared’<sup>12</sup>. In Turkmen, *hā:zir* stands for ‘now’, but with a long pronounced vowel in the first syllable. Further, as noted by Caferoğlu and Doerfer [33, p. 302] *hazır* is present in the *Äinaullu* dialect, one of the Turkic-speaking groups in Iran. The authors give the following example: *män hāzārem*, ‘I’m almost ready’.

Further, our linguistic data has a recorded of a single case, when the apprehension was expressed with the word *az gala* and the affix -(y)AcAk, i.e., formally a kind of mixture of Cypriot Turkish and Turkish:

(10) \* **az gala** guzimī ye-yceg

**a bit more** lamb eat-FUT?/SUPPOS?-3.Sg

‘A bit more and she would have eaten my lamb’? or ‘A bit more and she eats my lamb’?

The affix -(y)AcAk does not only convey the meaning of definite future, but can also express an assumption [8, p. 199, 209–211; 9, p. 338, 366, 543; 10, p. 241–242, 278]. In this example, on the one hand, the speaker communicates an event undesired to him via the adverb *az gala*, and, on the other hand, uses -(y)AcAk instead of -sIn for 3<sup>rd</sup> person singular, as should be expected commonly in CT. Such expression of apprehension by an informant, a woman of almost 60 years old, who has not received education in Turkish universities, is interesting because of the intensive CT-Turkish language contacts. Thus, the question — whether the expression of apprehension seen here is an *intermediate phenomenon*, i.e., neither yet standard Turkish, nor Cypriot Turkish altogether, or this is a case when the discussed semantics can be expressed by temporal forms, like in the other Oghuz languages, will be answered by future research.

## **6. Formulas to express the apprehension:**

### **Turkish, Azerbaijani and Turkmen compared with Cypriot Turkish**

Formulas for expressing apprehension in Turkish, Cypriot Turkish, Azerbaijani, and Turkmen<sup>13</sup> are presented below in tabular form:

<sup>12</sup> In Kyrgyz, азыр ‘now’ is known as a circumstantial word with temporal meaning, which is used to specify the time of action expressed by the verb in past definite tense.

<sup>13</sup> On the modes of expressing apprehensive and precaution in Azerbaijani, see Sakhatova *On apprehensive in Azerbaijani* (in press); on the modes of expressing apprehensive in Turkmen, see also Sakhatova



Table 1

Language	Formulas
Cypriot Turkish	<i>hazir/az gala</i> + Vst + -(y)AyIm (Voluntative 1 <sup>st</sup> person singular) <i>hazir/az gala</i> + Vst + -sIn (Voluntative 3 <sup>rd</sup> person singular)
Turkmen	Circumstantial adverb: <i>tas</i> 1. <i>tas</i> + Vst + -IpDI + PE 2. <i>tas</i> + Vst + -(y)ArDI + PE
Modern Turkish	Circumstantial adverbs: <i>neredeyse/az kaldı/az daha/az kalsın</i> 1. <i>az kalsın</i> + Vst + -(y)AcAkDI + PE 2. <i>az kalsın</i> + Vst + -(I)yordu + PE 3. <i>az kalsın</i> + Vst + -mİşDI + PE 4. -AcAk (also with verbs of apprehension, supposition, etc.)
Azerbaijani	Circumstantial adverbs: <i>az qalib (ki), az qala, az keçə</i> <i>az qalib (ki)</i> + Vst + -(y)AyIm (Voluntative 1 <sup>st</sup> person singular) <i>az qalib (ki)</i> + Vst + — sIn (Voluntative 3 <sup>rd</sup> person singular) <i>az qala</i> + Vst + -(y)AcAkDI + PE <i>az keçə</i> + Vst + -mİşDI + PE

Table 2

Language	Modal category
Cypriot Turkish	Voluntative
Azerbaijani	Voluntative

Table 3

Language	Tense category: Past tense
Turkmen	a) -(y)ArDI (present perfect-future in the past / past continuous tense) b) -IpDI (pluperfect/ past perfect tense)
Modern Turkish	a) -(I)yordu (imperfective definite /present perfect) <sup>14</sup> b) -mİşDI (pluperfect/ past perfect tense)
Azerbaijani	a) -mİşDI (pluperfect/ past perfect tense)

Table 4

Language	Tense category: Future tense
Turkish	Voluntative

(in press); apprehensive in Oghuz subgroup of Turkic languages, see also Sakhatova (in press); in this connection cf. also other modes of conveying apprehensive about undesirable events, for example, in Karachay-Balkar, — morphological, i.e., with one integrated affix -гъЫ эди: *жауун жауп иш къалма+гъы эди* 'It looks like raining', described in the work by L. Ulmezova [34, p. 45].

<sup>14</sup> According to Guzev's definition [8, p. 201–202].

<sup>15</sup> See A. Kononov about the meanings of the future categorical tense, for example for 3<sup>rd</sup> person, assumption on the probability of an event [10, p. 235].

Table 5

Languages	Mixed tense categories: Future perfect tense / Future in the past
Turkish and Azerbaijani	-(y)AcAkId / -(y)AcAk+ idi (> (y)AcAktI)

In all four languages, the semantics of the apprehension ‘a bit more and an undesirable event could have happened’ is conveyed by grammatical markers and lexical units; in Turkish and Azerbaijani, it can also be conveyed by morphological markers alone. In Turkish, lexical units are represented by circumstantial adverbs *az kalsın / neredeyse / az kaldı / az daha*; in Azerbaijani — such adverbs as *az qalib / az qala / az keçsə*, and *az gala / hazır* — in Cypriot Turkish. The following observation is interesting in this respect. All these circumstantial adverbs are specified by different markers, both temporal and modal, including markers of the conditional mood: -sA (*az keçsə*), -sIn (*az kalsın*), -dI (*az kaldı*), -(y)Ise (*neredeyse*), -Ib (*az qalib*), -A (*az qala/az gala*). The Turkmen adverb *tas* stands apart in this series, but is equal by its semantics.

The discussed type of the apprehensive can be shaped morphologically by hortative markers (Voluntative) in Cypriot Turkish and Azerbaijani. Moreover, the Azeri-, Turkmen- and Turkish speakers use differing forms of the past and future tense for this purpose. Expressing the semantics of an undesirable probable event in Azerbaijani provides a speaker with two types of instruments, modal markers and tense forms. Turkmen- and Turkish speakers have similarity in implementing the apprehension via the affixes of the past continuous tense and imperfective definite<sup>16</sup>.

In all three languages of Oghuz group, with the exception of Cypriot Turkish, the apprehensive meaning is also implemented via temporal markers, past perfect /pluperfect; they are grammatically identical in Azerbaijani and Turkish, while in Turkmen it is implemented using affix -Ipdl.

With regard to the Turkish, attention needs to be drawn to the following two aspects. First, conveying the apprehension in modern Turkish with an outdated affix -Ayaz is found in colloquial speech, most often regional, for example, in the dialects of Antalya: *seni beklerken uyuyazdım*, ‘I nearly fell asleep while waiting for you’ [27, p. 106], *düşeyazdım* ‘I almost fell asleep’ [9, p. 79].

Guzev [8, p. 153] calls this form **Aktionsart**, which has the meaning of a subjunctive modality, signaling that the action could have been performed, but actually had not; for example, *orda bir gün düşeyazmışım* ‘Once I nearly fell there’. Ersen-Rasch [2012: 252–253] also puts -Ayaz as an **Aktionsart** form with the semantics of an undesirable situation, when the speaker was able to avoid it in good time.

Second, during field expeditions in the North-West of Turkey, aimed at studying the language of Meskhetian Turks<sup>17</sup> from Georgia, the author of this article documented the

<sup>16</sup> See Guzev [8, p. 226], where affixes -(y)AcAk idi (> (y)AcAktI) are viewed as independent morphological markers for implementing the subjunctive modality in Turkish. Further, the author notes: ‘The lack of subjunctive mood in Turkic grammars can be explained only as a misapprehension [...]’ V. Guzev also speaks about the elaboration of a hypothesis on the presence of two subjunctive moods in Turkish, — conjunctive and imperative-optative mood (subjunctive) [8, p. 176–180, 219–220].

<sup>17</sup> Also known as *Ahıska-Türkleri*.

mode of expressing apprehension, which consists of the circumstantial adverb *az kala* and the verb formed with the affix -dI of the past tense, for example:

- 11) **az kala düş-tü-m**  
**nearly fell-Perf-1.Sg**  
**APPR**

‘A bit more and I would have fallen / a bit more and I could have fallen’

As can be seen from this example, the adverb *az kala* is found in the apprehensive model not only in Cypriot Turkish and Azerbaijani, but in other Turkic idioms, as well. The speaker formalizes the semantics of apprehension with the affix -dI of the past tense. This affix is known as multifunctional; its functions include, *inter alia*, conveying evidentiality of a situation in Cypriot Turkish, where it adds to the verb instead of the expected -mIş [3; 35; 36, p. 326, 339–343; 37, p. 267–268, 271]<sup>18</sup>.

## 7. Conclusion

The analysis of language modes and markers for expressing apprehension in Cypriot Turkish, as well as the comparison between models of the apprehensive in Turkmen, Turkish, and Azerbaijani, allowed us to identify morphological analogies with Cypriot Turkish (especially for Azerbaijani). Another finding of importance is the presence of the adverb *az gala* in Meskhetian-Turkish semantics of the apprehensive. Thus, the following conclusions can be drawn for this research.

The expression of the apprehensive is a subjective, vibrant assessment of an event, given by the speaker, perceived by him/ her emotionally as an undesirable event, which could happen in a moment, either during speech communication, or in the foreseeable or immediate future. Moreover, an undesirable event does not necessarily, or not always, imply the unpleasantness of an action or event (see examples 5, 7, 9), depending on the context. Further, Cypriot-Turkish informants commonly placed circumstantial adverbs before the finite verb. As seen from the examples, the repertoire of a CT speaker has only one lexical and morphological model to implement the semantics of the apprehension, which is similar to that in Azerbaijani, whereas the Turkmen speaker has two, the Azerbaijani and Turkish speakers — four models.

1. The earlier assumptions were based on a generalized comparison between the modes of building modal, unreal constructions in Cypriot Turkish and modern Turkish, and in the case of their non-coincidence considered them borrowed from Greek-Cypriot. However, these speculations remain controversial, due to the scarce number of compared, genetically related languages and need for further research.

Language contacts are undoubtedly the driving force of changes in any language. The history of Turkic languages is the history of their interaction with other languages *par excellence*. It is also known that Turkic languages have intrinsic stability, against the inherent ability to change from within. Further research in this area should also account for a history of the languages under study. Cypriot Turkish and Standard Turkish have a common

---

<sup>18</sup> Issues related to the functions of the affix -dI to express the apprehension in the example (11), whether the speaker has discovered personally, or only speculated on an upcoming undesirable event, etc., should be investigated in more detail in the future studies.

linguistic past and a common, cross-lingual and contact-associated present<sup>19</sup>. Further, in the context of Cypriot bi- and multilingualism, the strength of language contacts should be considered as well, which is directly associated with (a) the number of people speaking more than one language; (b) language proficiency (oral and writing skills, understanding, etc.); and (c) duration of the language contacts [38, p. 66–68].

2. The Cypriot Turkish mode of expressing apprehension is not a product of recent Greek-Turkish language contacts. Our analysis shows that the semantics of apprehension in Turkic languages can be conveyed both by the temporal and verbal mood markers, in this case, by the Voluntative markers and lexical units that reinforce the meaning of apprehension. As demonstrated by the given Cypriot Turkish examples, where the discussed semantics is implemented within the hortatory/voluntary mood spectrum, it looks intriguing that the greatest semantic load to express the apprehension is carried by the circumstantial adverbs *hazır*, rather than morphological markers. Were it not for the lexical unit *hazır*, as a special carrier of a semantic meaning, or rather the amplifier of the irreal semantics in this case, these would be just constructions devoid of the modal-assessment quintessence, expressing (spontaneous) desires, the will of a speaker to do something all by him/ herself or in relation to a 3<sup>rd</sup> person.

3. The mode of expression of the apprehensive type under study, ‘a bit more and an undesirable event could occur’ is a *pre-Cypriot*, i.e., is not an acquired or borrowed phenomenon resulting from Cypriot-Greek-Turkish language contacts. Both the morphological analogies and the presence of the adverb *hazır* give reason to believe that the Cypriot Turkish grammatical and semantic-lexical model of expressing apprehension is a product of the earlier, most likely Turkic-Persian language contacts. Consequently, the Cypriot Turkish model of expressing apprehension, as it appears today, was probably available in the inventory of Turkic native speakers relocated to Cyprus after its conquest.

4. Further, our analysis clearly illustrates imperative-voluntative polysemy, which has an expressive character and, along with its main meaning, also serves to convey emotions such as anxiety, fear, apprehension, etc. In this case, the speaker either signals, or bespeaks, or wants to attract attention to any unexpected and undesirable, from his point of view, event.

5. The comparative panorama of linguistic markers for expressing the semantics of the apprehension in Oghuz languages has again proved the insistent need to initiate their study and typological systematization of interrelations between the temporal and verbal mood markers, lexical units, and modal meanings, which would expand and revise the traditional, deeply-rooted ideas about the linguistic instruments of modality expression in Turkic languages. Thus, the identified linguistic instruments for conveying the semantics of this type of apprehensive with modal-assessment sense of the undesirable situation in the above mentioned Turkic languages, reconfirm the presence of additional modal categories<sup>20</sup>.

<sup>19</sup> The Ottoman language, which had borrowed extensively from the Persian (especially in the areas of syntax and modality expression) after the conquest of the island in the late 16th century, was a language of writing, education and administrative office until the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, i.e., up to the Turkish language reform.

<sup>20</sup> See Guzev [8, p. 219–220, 225–228, 232–233] on the imaginary nature of an event, analytical forms with the meaning of supposition and contextual elaboration of a hypotheses about the existence of subjunctive moods — conjunctive and imperative-optative (subjunctive) in Turkish, since word forms [...] of the imperative and optative moods act as one category, which in the first and second persons of both

6. The real existence of *undesirable modality* in these languages should be acknowledged; it is expressed grammatically by: a) hortative mood (Voluntative) forms; b) temporal markers of the present, future and past tenses; c) is accompanied by lexical units as modal meanings of ‘nearly’, ‘a little bit more and’, ‘almost’, that attribute a qualifying touch to the subjective-expressive attitude of the speaker to the undesirable event, which d) could have happened in a moment, i.e., is located in the zone of the present, past, or immediate/ foreseeable future, which remained unimplemented, despite being assessed by the speaker as an *event with the greatest degree of probability*, based on both his/ her real past experience and perception formed at the time of the forthcoming undesirable situation.

### List of abbreviations in the morphemic string

1.Sg	— 1 <sup>st</sup> person singular
3.Sg	— 3 <sup>rd</sup> person singular
Acc	— accusative
APPR	— apprehensive
Dat	— dative
FUT	— future tense
Loc	— locative
OPT	— optative
PE	— personal endings of verbs
PERF	— past tense
Poss	— possessive
SUPPOS	— probability / supposition
VOL	— voluntative

### References

1. Plungian V. A. *Vvedenie v grammaticheskuiu semantiku: Grammaticheskie znacheniiia i grammaticheskie sistemy iazykov mira* [Introduction to grammatical semantics: grammatical meanings and grammatical systems of the languages of the world]. Moscow, RGGU Publ., 2011. (In Russian)
2. Plungian V. A. *Obshchaia morfologiya. Vvedenie v problematiku* [General morphology. Introduction to the problematics]. Moscow, URSS, 2000. (In Russian)
3. Plungian V. A. O kontrafakticheskikh upotrebleniyakh plyuskvamperfekta [On counterfactual uses of pluperfect]. *Issledovaniya po teorii grammatiki. Vypusk 3: Irrealis i irreal'nost'* [Studies in the theory of grammar. Issue 3: Irrealis and unreality]. Moscow, Gnozis Publ., 2004, pp. 273–292. (In Russian)
4. Elliott J. R. Realis and Irrealis: Forms and Concepts of the grammaticalisation of reality. *Linguistic typology*, 2000, vol. 4–1, pp. 55–90.
5. Lichtenberk F. Apprehensional epistemics. *Modality in grammar and discourse*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia, 1995, pp. 293–327.
6. Urmanchiyeva A. Sed'moye dokazatel'stvo real'nosti irrealisa [Seventh proof of the reality of irrealis]. *Issledovaniya po teorii grammatiki. Vypusk 3: Irrealis i irreal'nost'* [Studies in the theory of grammar. Issue 3: Irrealis and unreality]. Moscow, Gnozis Publ., 2004, pp. 28–74. (In Russian)
7. Dobrushina N. R. Grammaticheskiye formy i konstruktii so znacheniyem opaseniya i predosterezheniya [Grammatical forms and constructions with the meaning of fear and caution]. *Voprosy yazykoznaniiya* [Questions of linguistics], 2006, no. 2, pp. 28–67. (In Russian)

singular and plural most often has optative markers, and in the 3<sup>rd</sup> person — an imperative marker, as a rule. See also [39, p. 123, 163–164].

8. Guzev V.G. *Teoreticheskaia grammatika turetskogo iazyka* [Theoretical grammar of the Turkish language]. St. Petersburg, St. Petersburg University Press, 2015. (In Russian)
9. Göksel A., Kerslake C. *Turkish. A comprehensive grammar*. London, New York, Routledge, 2005.
10. Kononov A. N. *Grammatika sovremennogo turetskogo literaturnogo iazyka* [Grammar of the Modern Turkish Literary Language]. Moscow, Leningrad, Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1956. (In Russian)
11. Adamović M. *Konjugationsgeschichte der türkischen Sprache*. Leiden, E. J. Brill, 1985.
12. Ersen-Rasch M. *Türkische Grammatik ausführlich und verständlich. Lernstufen A 1 bis C1*. Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz Verlag, 2012.
13. Aslan-Demir S. Türkiye Türkçesi istek kategorisine semantik-pragmatik bir yaklaşım (Semantic and pragmatic approaches to the category of the desiderative/optative in modern Turkish). *Uluslararası Asya ve Kuzey Afrika Çalışmaları Kongresi*, 2007, 10–15 Eylül.
14. Abdurrazak G. Y. *The tense, aspect, mood-modality system of the Turkish spoken in Cyprus. A sociolinguistic perspective*. London, SOAS, University of London, 2012.
15. Argunşah M. Yaşayan Kıbrıs Türk Ağzı [Living Cypriot Turkish dialect]. *Türk Dili* [Turkish Language], 2003, no. 614, pp. 193–202.
16. Demirci M., Kleiner B. The perception of Turkish dialects. *Handbook of perceptual dialectology*. Vol. 1. Amsterdam, Philadelphia, John Benjamin Publishing Company, 1999.
17. İnalçık H. Kıbrıs'ta Türk idaresi altında nüfus [Cyprus Population under Turkish Administration]. *Kıbrıs ve Türkler* [Cyprus and Turks]. Ankara, 1964, pp. 27–58.
18. Pehlivan A. Aya İrini'den Akdeniz'e Kıbrıs Ağzının Değişimi [The Changes of the Cyprus Dialect from the Hagia Irini to the Mediterranean Sea]. Lefkoşa, Adım Yayıncılık, 2003.
19. Saracoğlu E. *Kıbrıs ağzı* [Cyprus Dialect]. Ankara, Akçağ Yayınları, 2012.
20. Demir N., Johanson L. Dialect contact in Northern Cyprus. *International Journal of the sociology of language*, 2006, no. 181, pp. 1–9.
21. Kappler M. Language policy and language planning in the northern part of Cyprus. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 2011, vol. 12, issue 4, pp. 33–47.
22. Osam N., Ağazade A. S. The status of Turkish in the Republic of Cyprus and the attitudes of Greek Cypriots toward Turkish language learning. *Turkic Languages*, 2004, no. 8, pp. 271–288.
23. Kappler M. A tale of two languages: Tracing the history of Turkish-Greek language contacts. *Türk dilleri araştırmaları* [Turkish language studies], 2011, no. 21, pp. 95–130.
24. Osam N., Keleşir M. Bibliography of studies on Turkish Cypriot Dialect. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 2006, no. 181, pp. 107–117.
25. Abdurrazak G. Kıbrıs'ta türkler tarafından konuşulan lisanın adı ne olmalıdır? [What should the language spoken by the Turks in Cyprus be called?]. *Diyaletoloji* [Dialectology], 2012, no. 40, pp. 89–103. (In Turkish)
26. Vancı-Osam Ü. The impact of oral language features in written language in Cypriot Turkish. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 2006, no. 181, pp. 23–43.
27. Demir N. Kıbrıs ağızları üzerine notlar [Notes on Cyprus dialects]. *Scholarly depth and accuracy. Festschrift to Lars Johanson*. Ankara, 2002, pp. 100–110.
28. Kappler M. Contact-induced effects in the syntax of Cypriot Turkish. *Turkic Languages*, 2008, no. 12–2, pp. 203–220.
29. Kappler M., Tsiplakou S. Is there a common Cypriot subjunctive? *Mediterranean Language Review*, 2015, vol. 22, pp. 139–155.
30. Gulle O. V. Structural borrowings in Cypriot Turkish from Cypriot Greek. *Mediterranean Language Review*, 2011, vol. 18, pp. 91–113.
31. Aikhenvald A. *Language contact in Amazonia*. Oxford, 2002.
32. Shcherbak A. M. *Ocherki po sravnitel'noi morfologii tiurkskikh iazykov. Glagol* [Essays on the Comparative Morphology of Turkic Languages. Verb]. Leningrad, Nauka Publ., 1981. (In Russian)
33. Caferoğlu A., Doerfer G. Das Aserbaidzschische. *Philologiae Turicae Fundamenta*. Wiesbaden, Franz Steiner, 1959, pp. 280–308.
34. Ulmezova L. M. O termine «soslagatel'nogo nakloneniia» v tiurkskikh iazykakh na primere karachaevo-balkarskogo i turetskogo iazykov [About the term “subjunctive mood” in Turkic languages on the example of Karachay-Balkar and Turkish languages]. *Vestnik of Saint Petersburg University. Series 13*, 2012, issue 2, pp. 42–46. (In Russian)
35. Sahatova G. Morphologie und Semantik der, vermittelten Evidentialität' im Zyperntürkischen. *Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher*, 2016, pp. 123–138.



36. Plungian V. A., Van der Auwera J. Towards a typology of discontinuous past marking. *Sprachtypol. Univ. Forschung (STUF)*, 2006, no. 59–4, pp. 317–349.
37. Rentzsch J. *Modality in the Turkic languages. Form and meaning from a historical and comparative perspective*. Berlin, Klaus-Schwarz-Verlag, 2015.
38. Thomason S. G. *Language in Contact: An Introduction*. Washington, D.C., Georgetown University Press, 2001.
39. *Temporal'nost'. Modal'nost'. Teoriia funktsional'noi grammatiki [Temporality. Modality. Theory of functional grammar]*. Ed. by A. V. Bondarko and others. Leningrad, Nauka Publ., 1990. (In Russian)

Received: April 25, 2018

Accepted: June 15, 2018

Author's information:

Gulshen S. Sakhatova — Dr. Sci. in Philology; gulshen.sakhatova@uni-goettingen.de

## Способы выражения опасения в кипро-турецком языке

Г. С. Сахатова

Гёттингенский университет им. Георга-Августа,  
Германия, 37073, Гёттинген, Генрих-Дюкер-Берг, 14

**Для цитирования:** Sakhatova G. S. Apprehensive in Cypriot Turkish // Вестник Санкт-Петербургского университета. Востоковедение и африканистика. 2018. Т. 10. Вып. 3. С. 315–329. <https://doi.org/10.21638/spbu13.2018.303>

В работе рассматриваются способы выражения опасения, категории, известной в научной литературе как *apprehensive* в огузских языках на примере кипро-турецкого языка (КТ), обнаруженные во время полевых экспедиций на Кипре. На основе собранного автором языкового материала описываются грамматические и лексические средства для выражения семантики опасения по поводу нежелательной, с точки зрения говорящего, ситуации, которая вот-вот могла бы случиться. Эти средства в КТ отличаются от средств образования апрехенсива в турецком языке, вследствие чего исследователи склонны считать их *нетюркскими*, т. е. сложившимися под влиянием языковых контактов на острове, в первую очередь турецкого с кипро-греческим языком (КГ). В работе наряду с описанием актуальной ситуации КТ на Кипре с целью сравнительного описания будут также даны формулы способов выражения обсуждаемого типа опасения в других генетически родственных языках, таких как современный турецкий, азербайджанский и туркменский языки. На основании обнаруженных аналогий утверждается, что кипро-турецкий способ выражения семантики опасения не является результатом турецко-греческих языковых контактов и, по всей вероятности, уже имелся в тюркском инвентаре носителей языка до их переселения на остров Кипр после его завоевания Османской империей в 1570–1571 гг.

**Ключевые слова:** апрехенсив, огузские языки, кипро-турецкий язык, турецкий язык на Кипре, турецкий язык, азербайджанский язык, туркменский язык, показатели апрехенсива, выражение опасения в тюркских языках.

Контактная информация:

Сахатова Гюльшен Сахатовна — д-р филол. наук; gulshen.sakhatova@uni-goettingen.de